

**REMARKS**

The Final Examiner's Action mailed on July 13, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Claims 10-12 and 21 have been canceled, and the limitations of canceled claim 21 have been incorporated into claim 17 from which it originally depended. Reexamination and reconsideration of the amended application respectfully is requested. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner finally rejected claims 10, 12 and 17-21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sekine et al.* in view of *Admission* or *Frye et al.* Claims 10, 12 and 21 have been canceled, and claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 21. The rejection of claims 21 respectfully is traversed.

The amendment to claim 17 clarifies that in the projection electrode-forming step, the projection electrodes are formed with a height such that the top end of each projection electrode is between the height of the active surface of the semiconductor chips and a height of an inactive surface of the semiconductor chips. This feature clearly is neither shown nor suggested by the cited references. Claims 17-20 are believed clearly to be patentable also for the same reasons advanced in applicant's response of March 31, 2005, and reconsideration of those arguments and withdrawal of the rejection respectfully are requested.

The Examiner also rejected claims 10 and 12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Egawa* in view of *Admission* or *Frye et al.* The rejection is moot since claims 10 and 12 have been canceled.

Atty Docket: AI 264NP

The Examiner also rejected claims 3, 4, 6 and 26-28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sekine et al.* in view of *Fukasawa et al.* and *Ichikawa*. The rejection is traversed for reasons presented in the response filed March 31, 2005 in reply to the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 6. The Examiner is requested to reconsider the rejection of claims 3, 4, 6 and 26-28 in view of those reasons, and withdraw the rejection.


The Examiner also rejected claim 29, which depends from claim 17, over the prior art, including the references cited against claims 17-20 and *Rai*. *Rai* fails to disclose the features of claim 17 missing from the references cited against claim 17. Therefore, claim 29 is patentable at least since it depends from claim 17, and accordingly should be withdrawn.

Therefore, based on the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such a Notice, with allowed claims 3, 4, 6, 17-20, and 26 - 29, earnestly is solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that another conference may help to expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference. Should any additional fee be required, or if no payment is attached, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002 and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

October 11, 2005  
Date

  
Steven M. Rabin - Reg. No. 29,102  
RABIN & BERDO, PC  
Telephone: 202-371-8976  
Facsimile: 202-408-0924  
Customer No. 23995

SMR/pjl

AMENDMENT

(09/830,092)